

Operational Advisory Group (OAG)

09 March 2021 meeting

DRAFT Minutes



Operational Advisory Group

Draft minutes of 9 March 2021 meeting

Attendees

OAG Members and Guests

- ◆ Ashley Connors, Wholesaler
- ◆ David Harris (DH) Wholesaler
- ◆ David Moss (DM) Retailer
- ◆ Heidi Knapton, Wholesaler
- ◆ Jenny Ansell (JA) Wholesaler
- ◆ Madeleine Moores (MM) Retailer
- ◆ Matthew Garfield, Wholesaler
- ◆ Michael Floyd (MF) Wholesaler
- ◆ Onkar Singh, Wholesaler
- ◆ Paul Baker, Wholesaler
- ◆ Sam Dawson, Wholesaler
- ◆ Jon Fuller (JF) Wholesaler
- ◆ Julie-Ann Anderson, Wholesaler
- ◆ Kat Grimley, Wholesaler
- ◆ Lewis Orr, Retailer

MOSL

- ◆ Evan Joannette (EJ) OAG Chair
- ◆ Chris Dawson (CD)
- ◆ Kevin Fearn (KF)
- ◆ Mayuresh Tamboli (MT)
- ◆ Chris Chiorean (CC)
- ◆ Markus Lloyd
- ◆ Oliver Robins
- ◆ Pam Nash
- ◆ Axelle Saada
- ◆ Lisa-Ann Lott (LAL) - Secretariat

Agenda

- ◆ Code amendment review
 - Material feedback on CSD 701, 704, Ops Terms
- ◆ Approve Summary and Sign-off pack
- ◆ Transactional level R-Mex feedback
- ◆ MPF integration
- ◆ Business continuity/forms
- ◆ AOB
 - Data Item D8228
 - Codifying charges against transferred service requests
 - Assume incoming

Meeting notes

1. MPF integration

ML provided an overview of the Market Performance Framework and assured the OAG feedback is being considered by the MPC and MPF subgroup via the Bilaterals Team. The Bilaterals along with MPF are both integrated with each other through the MOSL business plan.

EJ asked if OAG proposals relating to SLAs have thus far been made in line with MPF roadmap. ML agreed they had.

EJ clarified that the OAG would not be doing a full MPF review, only looking at SLAs as and when they needed to be adjusted to work with the bilateral hub. ML confirmed there was no expectation on the OAG to do a full MPF review.

2. Code amendment review

PB queried the notification requirements on trading Parties within CSD 0701. Wording shows as 'to notify other relevant trading parties' PB asked, should the hub not be doing this. CD confirmed this will be automated however in the case of a business continuity incident the responsibility would fall back onto the retailer.

ACTION: MOSL to review wording around "notify other party".

MF queried whether all three attempts to contact customer have to be made before a deferral is made. CD confirmed no.

ACTION: MOSL to review and update wording around deferrals where customer contact hasn't been made

MF queried the deferrals table in 14 is not in line with the C1r process flow – when can you refer? CD confirmed to follow the table at this stage as opposed to the process flow which still needs updating. EJ confirmed flexible deferrals are by design in code drafting as per OAG process review.

MF queried timeouts on deferrals and which business days are included/excluded in the SLAs. CD confirmed deferrals are not automatic and would start from the date entered and would be removed automatically when the retailer updated the information

JF recommends that any approach is aligned to current OPS reporting guidance.

ACTION: MOSL(CC) OAG(JF/MF) to review Ops Terms to ensure clarity in how business days for deferrals are explained

3. Summary and Sign off Pack

EJ led OAG members through the summary and sign-off pack and requested a view from the members on whether;

- this document sufficiently summarised OAG's work for the rest of the industry and

- that it fairly represented their support of the C1.R and C1.W processes.

DM content with summary of contributions from relevant parties involved in process review. Level of detail appropriate for intended audience.

SD time is a premium and TPs will appreciate a document that summarises the work that has gone into process review. Supports high level overview and quick way to see what's changed. Proposes that summary pack could include a Release Notes for any new code docs. EJ agree this was a good suggestion.

Outcome: OAG members generally supportive of the document, its content and its purpose to update the industry. Members confirm they are minded to support C1.R and C1.W.

4. Transactional level R-Mex feedback

JA showed a slide demonstrating how LVI users use SWIMpool at any point in the process to provide a 5 point scale (represented by sad/happy faces) of feedback. Gives retailer the opportunity to provide feedback to the wholesaler on the service provided against a request

DM agreed this is a useful tool. Supports some integration of feedback into problem parts of the process, like rejections or disputes.

PB agreed it would be useful. However, where TP systems are integrated and they are not using the bilateral hub, to require the bilateral hub would diminish likelihood of use. Furthermore, those who are likely to be able to provide feedback are not those using the hub. Says this is their experience with Swimpool.

CC argued this could be used as part of R-Mex and link to MPS/OPS or sent to customers for feedback.

AC highlighted only small number of retailers complete the feedback at present thus lowering its usability will need both encouragement to use and possibly rules to ensure use with low volume of feedback.

SD confirmed their organisation would report very poor cost benefit as they get no feedback at all via SWIMpool from their primary retailer.

JF confirmed support. Proposed mandatory and simple were key. A couple of data items in the closure transaction would allow for easier integration into the bilateral hub and company systems.

DH suggested a valid set of criteria that responder could say they are rating, to offer more context. Free text/commentary is hard to quantify for reporting.

OS remarked that the volume of feedback and rating trends would be a starting point for further investigation by the business into service delivery. Focus more on big picture/conversation starter than creating too much onus on those filling it in.

EJ asked if there's merit in Wholesalers rating Retailers.

JF/AC/DM proposed other hub metrics (e.g. like rejections) would be providing objective proxy for feedback. A red angry face may only confirm what we already now.

LO Suggests members not overlook the capacity of the rating system to give positive feedback to retailers.

EJ asked if there's merit in customers being polled for feedback

DM/AC feel that the customer feedback absent of context of what the customer did or did not see of the TPs' engagement, may not be less valuable.

MG suggests this may be a way of getting ahead of the game if Ofwat compels a B-Mex in the market

Outcome: OAG members generally supportive but suggest issues around sufficient usage and context about what Retailers are actually rating. Enthusiasm more muted for Wholesalers using it to rate Retailer or for customers to be involved.

5. Business continuity

PN introduced herself as Bilaterals assurance lead and summarised the Bilaterals Assurance plan. Pam wants to understand TP's business continuity expectations in respect of the hub not being available for any reason. Baseline assumption is that assurance for hub will be the same as CMOS. MOSL to commit to no significant disruption longer than 1 day. TPs to have failover mechanisms to reconnect to MO interfaces.

LO noted that some TPs likely to not wait for long periods due to the retailer's limited flexibility to delay customers. Could not necessarily rely on FTP as is impractical when dealing with the other TP.

Members discussed difference between trading party system being down versus central Bilaterals hub and that the length of an outage may change the approach. Members highlighted need to ensure SLAs are extended to account for days lost by the hub not being available

EJ asked whether CMOS provides allowances for outages when it comes to SLAs. **CD** says it does not. But **JF** pointed out that CMOS data input (mostly meter readings) does allow "effective from" dates which someone mitigate the outage helping the inputter avoid an MPS charge.

ACTION: PN to develop scenarios/strawman for OAG members to review at next meeting (23 March)

LO and **JA** (later by email) offered to support Pam develop some strawman scenarios from a retailer perspective

6. AOB

DM picked up data item inconsistency whereby a valid set in data item D8228 is not as specific as in other data items. **EJ** proposed to carry forward to a future meeting where data items are reviewed. Unlikely any change now could be incorporated in the development anyway. **MT** confirmed that data sets could be changed, but may also change and rules associated with new items.

EJ Question about whether to codify cancellation charges to be carried forward to next meeting on 23 March 2021.

7. Actions:

1. MOSL to review wording around “notify other party”.
2. MOSL to review and update wording around deferrals where customer contact hasn’t been made.
3. MOSL(CC) OAG(JF/MF) to review Business Days in Ops Terms to ensure clarity.
4. MOSL (PN) to develop scenarios/strawman for OAG members to review at next meeting (23 March)